

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.usptn.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/771,280	02/03/2004	Richard N. Clark	2578.3008.002	9654
23399 75	90 11/09/2005		EXAMINER	
REISING, ETHINGTON, BARNES, KISSELLE, P.C.			ARK, DARREN W	
P O BOX 4390			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
IKOI, MII 40	TROY, MI 48099-4390		3643	

DATE MAILED: 11/09/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)		
Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	10/771,280	CLARK ET AL.		
_xammer maded meeting cammary	Examiner	Art Unit		
	Darren W. Ark	3643		
All Participants:	Status of Application: After	er Notice of Allowance		
(1) <u>Darren W. Ark</u> .	(3)			
(2) <u>William J. Waugaman</u> .	(4)			
Date of Interview: 8 November 2005	Time: <u>2:15pm EST</u>			
Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ Yes, provide a brief description:	nt's representative)			
Part I.				
Rejection(s) discussed: N/A				
Claims discussed: N/A				
Prior art documents discussed: N/A				
Part II.				
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENER See Continuation Sheet	RAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS	S DISCUSSED:		
Part III.	•			
 ☑ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. ☑ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above. 				
DARREN W. ARK PRIMARY EXAMINER				
Danen Wohl				
#Examiner/SPE Signature) (Applicant/	Applicant's Representative Si	gnature – if appropriate)		

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Applicant indicated to the Examiner that the communication filed 6/20/2005 was not a Rule 312 Amendment, but instead a Supplemental Declaration for placing evidence in the record that the inventors considered the claims as amended and allowed to still define their invention as originally claimed and disclosed. Examiner agreed with Applicant that denial of entry of the 312 Amendment was improper and that the response to the 312 Amendment mailed 11/1/2005 is withdrawn and that the Supplemental Declaration filed 6/20/2005 would be entered as part of the record.